

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-3

NEW YORK TIMES
5 June 1983

Shultz Replaced Latin Aides as Part of a Reagan Pact

By BERNARD D. GWERTZMAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 4 — Secretary of State George P. Shultz agreed to replace his two chief advisers on El Salvador as part of an arrangement he worked out with President Reagan 10 days ago to regain control of day-to-day management of Central American policy, well-placed Reagan Administration officials say.

The officials added that the two, Thomas O. Enders, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Deane R. Hinton, the Ambassador to El Salvador, were also dropped in an effort to end a bitter fight over that policy that had spread throughout the Administration.

In interviews in recent days, the officials said Mr. Enders and Mr. Hinton were replaced after a meeting between Mr. Shultz and Mr. Reagan at the White House. They said Mr. Shultz sought the meeting after Mr. Enders complained that the appointment by the White House of Richard B. Stone as a special envoy to Central America had raised further questions over whether the State Department was still in control of policy.

Dual Approach Reaffirmed

The main question, Mr. Enders reportedly said, was whether the Administration was committed to a dual approach of aiding El Salvador militarily while encouraging the start of a dialogue among the various countries and factions involved or whether, looking for a quick solution, it would place much more emphasis on military success.

According to aides to Mr. Shultz, the President told him that he remained committed to the dual approach publicly stated in his speech on Central America of April 27. The approach was long favored by Mr. Enders and Mr. Hinton, who have argued privately and publicly that it will take considerable time and patience to see any results in El Salvador. But interviews with officials in various agencies indicated that there are many who believe that a more dramatic approach by the President is needed to turn the tide.

According to a Shultz aide, Mr. Enders also acknowledged that his own personality may have contributed to feuds with White House, Defense Department and Central Intelligence Agency officials. One official noted that Mr. Enders had said it might be time for him to move to another post.

Mr. Shultz, in his conversation with Mr. Reagan, came to the conclusion that he had to "sacrifice" both Mr. En-

ders and Mr. Hinton, who for different reasons had run afoul of the White House, in order to re-establish the lines of policy, a senior State Department official said.

"The Secretary told the President," an aide said, "that we have to have a clear policy. There are too many people involved. We have to have the management of Central American policy run from the Assistant Secretary to the Secretary of State to the President."

"The President agreed with the thesis," the aide went on. "But part of the agreement involved the personnel changes of Enders and Hinton."

The changes, first announced last weekend, dramatized the tensions that had arisen in recent months between Mr. Enders and the National Security Council staff, headed by William P. Clark, as well as between Mr. Enders and certain senior officials in the C.I.A. and in the Pentagon.

Much of the problem, officials from all agencies agreed, involved personality clashes. Mr. Enders, at six-foot-eight, is an imposing and sometimes dominating figure, physically and intellectually. Close aides said he felt that many other Reagan officials did not understand what was going on in Central America and failed to realize that Congress would not support a major military and economic commitment to El Salvador, particularly one that could lead to the involvement of American forces or a major increase in the number of American advisers there.

As an example, aides cited the incident of the recent white paper on Communist subversion in Central America.

They said the C.I.A. produced the paper many months ago with the idea that it would be made public by the State Department. State Department officials said Mr. Enders and his staff decided that not only did the paper provide no new information of consequence but that it was written in too tendentious a manner.

"Tom decided to just sit on it," one official said. After several months, William J. Casey, director of Central Intelligence, complained, as did Mr. Clark.

State Department Yields

A major dispute broke out two weeks ago over the issue, with the State Department finally giving in to the C.I.A. and White House and making public a revised version on May 27, a few hours before Mr. Shultz announced that Mr. Enders was being replaced by Longhorne A. Motley, the Ambassador to Brazil.

Mr. Enders himself has declined to be interviewed since his transfer was announced.

The dispute over Mr. Stone was more significant than the white paper, officials said. The idea of appointing a special envoy had originated with Representative Clarence D. Long, Democrat of Maryland, who is chairman of a key House Appropriations subcommittee. He made his approval of the Administration's request to transfer military aid earmarked for other countries to El Salvador conditional on sending a special negotiator there.

But when the White House decided to name Mr. Stone as Ambassador at Large for all of Central America, the move was perceived by Mr. Enders — and eventually by Mr. Shultz — as an effort by the White House to circumvent the State Department. Mr. Shultz has now reached an understanding with the White House, an aide said, that Mr. Stone will report to him and that his actions will be monitored closely by the department.

Mr. Enders's policy problems began last year, his aides said, when he backed Mr. Hinton's efforts to persuade Salvadoran politicians not to allow the right wing to take power after it did surprisingly well in elections. He felt that a government led by Robert d'Aubisson, the rightist leader, would not obtain enough Congressional backing in Washington.

This approach had the White House's backing in 1982, but as the State Department began to press for more democratization in El Salvador, some criticism began to be heard of Mr. Enders in conservative publications, his aides said. And when Mr. Hinton gave an address, supported by Mr. Enders, attacking the far-right "death squads" in El Salvador, White House officials said they had not cleared the speech. This, officials said, undercut Mr. Hinton's efforts in El Salvador and caused severe friction between Mr. Clark and Mr. Enders.

STAT